



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,821	10/27/2003	Augustine Kuo	1875.5310000	9667

26111 7590 12/29/2006
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, LAWRENCE B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/29/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/692,821

Applicant(s)

KUO ET AL.

Examiner

Lawrence B. Williams

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1,7,10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 October 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. Figures 1-3 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: The examiner suggests "wherein each of" instead of "wherein each" in line 16 of the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2611

4. Claims 2 and 10 are objected to because of the following informalities: The examiner suggest applicant define the variables M and N.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Conroy et al. (US Patent 6,870,928 B1).

(1) With regard to claim 1, Conroy et al. discloses in Fig. 4, a circuit which decouples gains for a transmit signal and a receive signal of a broadband modem that is coupled to a telephone line, comprising: a multi-port transformer (42) including i) a line coil (inductors on n side of transformer, T1) electrically coupled to the telephone line (46); ii) a linedriver coil (44) electrically coupled to a broadband modem transmit line (TX_OUTP, TX_OUTM) carrying the transmit signal of the broadband modem; iii) a receive coil (48) electrically coupled to a broadband modem receive line (RX_INP, RX_INM) carrying the receive signal of the broadband modem; iv) wherein said line coil, said linedriver coil and said receive coil are magnetically coupled to each other (inherent since Fig. 4 discloses the multiport transformer (T1) comprising all three coils.) the line coil (inductors n side of transformer, T1), linedriver coil (44) and receive

Art Unit: 2611

coil (48); a bridge circuit (R14, R16, R24, R25) electrically coupled between said multi-port transformer(42) and the broadband modem receive line (RX_INP, RX_INM); and a pair of line matching resistors (parallel combination of R7, R8, parallel combination of R9, R12) electrically coupled between said multi-port transformer and the broadband modem transmit line, wherein each the line matching resistors match the telephone line resistance. Though Conroy et al. is silent on the subject that the parallel combinations of resistors match the telephone line resistance, such resistors for matching the impedance of the telephone line resistance are routine and would be inherent in line interface circuits as taught in both applicant's admitted prior art (Fig 3, pg. 7, paragraph [0027] and Conroy's prior art (Fig. 1). Conroy et al. has commented that not all routine features are shown or described (col. 3, lines 44-46).

(2) With regard to claim 3, Conroy et al. also discloses in Fig. 4, the circuit of claim 1, wherein said bridge circuit (R14, R16, R24, R25) is coupled to the broadband modem transmit line (coupled through R14, R24) and subtracts the transmit signal from the receive signal. Conroy et al. discloses the bridge circuit as a hybrid circuit (3) in reference to Fig. 2 (col. 1, line 32, and discloses the hybrid subtraction (col. 8, lines 28-31). The subtraction being the transmit signal from the receive signal would be inherent/routine to one skilled in the art. Conroy et al. has commented that not all routine features are shown or described (col. 3, lines 44-46).

(3) With regard to claim 4, Conroy et al. also discloses the circuit of claim 1, wherein the broadband modem is an ADSL modem (col. 1, line 13).

(4) With regard to claim 5, Conroy et al. also discloses the circuit of claim 1, wherein the broadband modem is a VDSL modem (col. 9, lines 4-9).

(5) With regard to claim 6, Conroy et al. also discloses the circuit of claim 1, wherein the broadband modem is a HDSL modem (col. 9, lines 4-9).

(7) With regard to claim 8, Conroy et al. discloses in Fig. 4, a broadband modem (col. 1, line 13) for coupling a broadband signal to a telephone line, comprising: a transmit circuit (From AFE) that provides a modem transmit signal (TX_OUTP, TX_OUTM); a receive circuit (To AFE) that receives a modem receive signal (RX_INP, RX_INM); a hybrid circuit (R14, R16, R24, R25, multiport transformer (42) coupled to said transmit circuit and said receive circuit which decouples gains for the modem transmit signal and the modem receive signal. Conroy et al. discloses a multiport transformer providing a step up ratio n for the transmit signal and a step-down ratio m for the receive signal (col. 5, lines 19-22).

(8) With regard to claim 9, Conroy et al. also discloses the broadband modem of claim 8, wherein said hybrid circuit comprises: a multi-port transformer (42) including i) a line coil (inductors on n side of transformer, T1) electrically coupled to the telephone line (46); ii) a linedriver coil (44) electrically coupled to a broadband modem transmit line (TX_OUTP, TX_OUTM) carrying the transmit signal of the broadband modem; iii) a receive coil (48) electrically coupled to a broadband modem receive line (RX_INP, RX_INM) carrying the receive signal of the broadband modem; iv) wherein said line coil, said linedriver coil and said receive coil are magnetically coupled to each other (inherent since Fig. 4 discloses the multiport transformer (T1) comprising all three coils.) the line coil (inductors n side of transformer, T1), linedriver coil (44) and receive coil (48); a bridge circuit (R14, R16, R24, R25) electrically coupled between said multi-port transformer(42) and the broadband modem receive line (RX_INP, RX_INM); and a pair of line matching resistors (parallel combination of R7, R8,

Art Unit: 2611

parallel combination of R9, R12) electrically coupled between said multi-port transformer and the broadband modem transmit line, wherein each the line matching resistors match the telephone line resistance. Though Conroy et al. is silent that the parallel combinations of resistors match the telephone line resistance, such resistors for matching the impedance of the telephone line resistance are routine and would be inherent in line interface circuits as taught in both applicant's admitted prior art (Fig 3, pg. 7, paragraph [0027] and Conroy's prior art (Fig. 1). Conroy et al. has commented that not all routine features are shown or described (col. 3, lines 44-46).

(9) With regard to claim 11, Conroy et al. also discloses wherein the broadband signal is an ADSL signal (col. 1, line 13).

(10) With regard to claim 12, Conroy et al. also discloses wherein the broadband signal is a VDSL signal (col. 9, lines 4-9).

(11) With regard to claim 13, Conroy et al. also discloses wherein the broadband signal is a HDSL signal (col. 9, lines 4-9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2611

8. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conroy et al. (US Patent 6,870,928 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Harrington et al. (US Patent 6,163,579).

(1) With regard to claim 2, as noted above, Conroy et al. teaches all limitations of claim 1 above. Conroy et al. does not teach wherein a turns ratio of the linedriver coil to said line coil is 1:N and a turns ratio of said receive coil to said line coil is M:N.

However, Harrington et al. teaches a broadband modem transformer hybrid wherein he discloses in Fig. 7, a turns ratio of a linedriver coil to a line coil is 1:N and a turns ratio of a receive coil to said line coil is M:N. Harrington et al. discloses a turns ratio of the linedriver coil to the line coil as 1:N and a turns ratio of the receive coil to said line coil is M:1. Thus if $N=1$, the receive coil to line ratio is M:N.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the teachings of Harrington et al. as a method of independently controlling the transmit and receive gains (col. 6, lines 31-36).

9. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conroy et al. (US Patent 6,870,928 B1) as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Harrington et al. (US Patent 6,163,579).

(1) With regard to claim 10, as noted above, Conroy et al. teaches all limitations of claim 9 above. Conroy et al. does not teach wherein a turns ratio of the linedriver coil to said line coil is 1:N and a turns ratio of said receive coil to said line coil is M:N.

However, Harrington et al. teaches a broadband modem transformer hybrid wherein he discloses in Fig. 7, a turns ratio of a linedriver coil to a line coil is 1:N and a turns ratio of a receive coil to said line coil is M:N. Harrington et al. discloses a turns ratio of the linedriver coil to the line coil as 1:N and a turns ratio of the receive coil to said line coil is M:1. Thus if $N=1$, the receive coil to line ratio is M:N.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the teachings of Harrington et al. as a method of independently controlling the transmit and receive gains (col. 6, lines 31-36).

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the instant application discloses a hybrid circuit for decoupling gains for a transmit signal and a receive signal. A search of prior art records has failed to teach or suggest: “a circuit of claim 1 which isolates narrowband voice signals from broadband signals, wherein i) said line coil includes a first line coil, a line capacitor and a second line coil, ii) wherein said linedriver coil includes a first linedriver coil, a linedriver capacitor and a second linedriver coil, iii) wherein said receive coil includes a first receive coil and a second receive coil, wherein a node between the first receive coil and the second receive coil is coupled to ground” as disclosed in claim 7.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a.) Robinson et al. discloses in US Patent 7,054,279 B2 Method and Apparatus For Optimizing Signal Transformation In A Frame- Based Communications Network.

b.) Sabouri et al. discloses in US Patent 6,925,172 B2 Line Interface With Gain Feedback Coupled Matching Impedance.

c.) Choksi discloses in US 2006/0062378 A1 Line Interface With Analog Echo Cancellation.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence B Williams whose telephone number is 571-272-3037. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ghayour Mohammad can be reached on 571-272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/692,821

Page 10

Art Unit: 2611

Lawrence B. Williams

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lawrence B. Williams', written over a horizontal line.

lbw

December 21, 2006